



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/565,770

09/20/2006

Frank Loeker

5003073.071US1

2986

29737 7590 03/03/2010
SMITH MOORE LEATHERWOOD LLP
P.O. BOX 21927
GREENSBORO, NC 27420

EXAMINER

DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

phil.mccann@smithmoorelaw.com
lorna.selvaggio@smithmoorelaw.com
mary.garner@smithmoorelaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/565,770	Applicant(s) LOEKER ET AL.	
	Examiner MIKE DOLLINGER	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11,18-20,23,24 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11,18-20,23,24 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 18-20, 23, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Smith et al (US 7,173,086 B2)

2. The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

3. Smith discloses superabsorbent polymer compositions comprising a superabsorbent polymer consisting essentially of a) from about 55 to about 99.9 wt% of polymerizable unsaturated acid group containing monomers, b) 0.001 to about 0.001 to about 5.0% by weight of internal crosslinking agents, c) 0.001 to about 5.0% by weight of surface crosslinking agent, g) from about 0.01 to about 5% by weight of an insoluble inorganic powder and h) from about 0.01 to 0.5% by weight of a thermoplastic polymer

Art Unit: 1796

[claim 1]. In the examples, Smith discloses superabsorbent polymer particles having a particle size of 150-850 microns [column 15 lines 45-49] that are prepared from a) acrylic acid [column 15 line 26] and c) an alkylene carbonate surface crosslinking agent [column 5 lines 27-34]. The inorganic particle g) is a fumed silica (AEROSIL 200) [column 15 lines 60-62] included in an amount of 0.4 % by weight [Table 2]. The thermoplastic polymer h) is preferably a polyester adhesive [Table 2 Examples 7-10] included in an amount of 0.15 or 0.3 % by weight [Table 2 Examples 7-10]. The polymers according to Smith can be employed in many products including sanitary towels, diapers or in wound coverings [column 9 lines 26-30] which read on a composite and a chemical product comprising the polymer particles. The inorganic particles g) preferably have a particle size of 100µm or less [column 6 lines 57-59].

4. Regarding the limitations toward inherent properties in claims 1-4 and 11, all the compositional and structural limitations of the powdery water absorbing polymer and each of its components are disclosed in Smith. Henceforth, all the claimed inherent properties of the materials must be present in the disclosed compositions and components. These properties are held to be inherently disclosed by Smith.

5. Regarding the limitations in claim 1, 18 and 28 requiring that the fine particle, thermoplastic adhesive, and water absorbing polymer particles are contacted during the production process of the water-absorbing particles or during secondary crosslinking are product-by-process limitations. The methods by which claimed composition are created by are not pertinent, unless applicant can show a different product is produced.

Art Unit: 1796

6. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 18-20, 23, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al (US 7,173,086 B2) with further evidence provided by Chem Crete.

7. Smith does not disclose the particle size of AEROSIL 200 which is the fumed silica used as the inorganic particle g) in the inventive examples, discussed above.

8. Chem Crete disclose that AEROSIL 200 has an average particle size of 12 nanometers [page 1].

9. Regarding the limitations toward inherent properties in claims 1-4 and 11, all the compositional and structural limitations of the powdery water absorbing polymer and each of its components are disclosed in Smith. Henceforth, all the claimed inherent properties of the materials must be present in the disclosed compositions and components. These properties are held to be inherently disclosed by Smith.

10. Regarding the limitations in claim 1, 18 and 28 requiring that the fine particle, thermoplastic adhesive, and water absorbing polymer particles are contacted during the production process of the water-absorbing particles or during secondary crosslinking are product-by-process limitations. The methods by which claimed composition are created by are not pertinent, unless applicant can show a different product is produced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1796

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 18-20, 23, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukaida et al (EP 0 612 533 A1 or US 5,672,419) in view of Sun et al (US 6,124,391). All references to Mukaida et al refer to EP 0 612 533 A1.

12. Mukaida et al disclose a water absorbent composition comprising (A) 100 parts by weight of water absorbing polymer particles [abstract], (B) 0.5 to 30 part of a resin of a resin powder having heat adhesion property [abstract], and 10 weight % or less of an organic or inorganic powder [6:44-49]. The size of the water absorbing polymer particles (A) is 0.1mm to 0.9mm [3:53-55] and the polymer may be a crosslinked or self-crosslinked polyacrylic acid salt [3:34]. The water absorbing polymer whose surface is further cross linked by crosslinkers (secondary crosslinking) may be used [3:44-46]. The resin powder (B) may be a polyester type resin as well as other condensation type polymers [4:3-7]. Mukaida et al also disclose the above composition adhered to a fibrous material [abstract] such as cellulose-type fibers and organic synthetic type fibers [4:48-49] which reads on a composite comprising a powder water absorbing polymer. The water absorbing material is useful for water absorptive goods such as disposable diapers and sanitary napkins [abstract] which read on a chemical product.

13. Mukaida et al do not disclose the particle size of the organic or inorganic powders added to the composition. Mukaida et al do disclose preferable inorganic powders as zeolite, silica, alumina, bentonite and activated carbon, etc. [6:45-46].

14. Sun et al disclose a mixture of superabsorbent polymer (SAP) particles and inorganic powder [4:47-48]. The SAP particles are polymerized from acrylic acid or

Art Unit: 1796

methacrylic acid salts [5:3-10]. The fine inorganic powder may comprise any of the claims including hydrated aluminum silicates [7:10-12]. The average size of the particles of the inorganic powder is preferably less than about 5 μm [7:17-18]. Sun et al teach that the admixture of these inorganic fine particles provides anti-caking characteristics to the SAP particles [1:7-11].

15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have prepared a powdery water absorbing polymer from a fine particle with a particle size of less than 200 μm , an adhesive thermoplastic and a water absorbing polymer particle because Mukaida et al teach that it is within the skill of the art to prepare a powdery water absorbing polymer from a fine particle, an adhesive thermoplastic and a water absorbing polymer particle and Sun et al teach that it is within the skill of the art to admix an SAP particle with a inorganic fine particle with an average particle size of 5 μm or less. One would have been motivated to use the inorganic fine particle of Sun et al in the composition of Mukaida et al to receive the expected benefit of anti-caking characteristics. Absent any evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in using an inorganic fine powder with an average particle size of less than 200 μm as the inorganic powder of Mukaida et al.

16. Regarding claim 10, Mukaida et al also do not disclose particular crosslinking agents suitable for the surface crosslinking reaction.

17. Sun et al, discussed above, disclose SAP particles with the same polymer composition as Mukaida et al and also disclose suitable surface crosslinking agents

Art Unit: 1796

including organic compounds such as a diol, a diamine, a diepoxide or an alkylene carbonate [6:21-25].

18. Selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use is *prima facie* obvious, see *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used an organic compound as a surface crosslinking agent with a polyacrylic acid water absorbing polymer particle composition because Mukaida et al teach that it is within the skill of the art to surface crosslink a polyacrylic acid water absorbing polymer particle with a crosslinking agents and Sun et al teach that it is within the ordinary skill of the art to utilize a diol, a diamine, a diepoxide or an alkylene carbonate as a surface crosslinking agent for SAP particles prepared from a polyacrylic acid. Absent any evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in utilizing an organic surface crosslinking agent for the water absorbing polymer particles for Mukaida et al.

19. Regarding the limitations toward inherent properties in claims 1-4 and 11, all the compositional and structural limitations of the powdery water absorbing polymer and each of its components are disclosed in Mukaida et al in view of Sun et al. Henceforth, all the claimed inherent properties of the materials must be present in the disclosed compositions and components. These properties are held to be inherently disclosed by Mukaida et al in view of Sun et al.

20. Regarding the limitations in claim 1, 18 and 28 requiring that the fine particle, thermoplastic adhesive, and water absorbing polymer particles are contacted during the

Art Unit: 1796

production process of the water-absorbing particles or during secondary crosslinking are product-by-process limitations. The methods by which claimed composition are created by are not pertinent, unless applicant can show a different product is produced.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

21. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 18-20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 11 and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 7,173,086 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they have substantially overlapping subject matter. The patent claims superabsorbent polymer compositions comprising a superabsorbent polymer consisting essentially of a) from about 55 to about 99.9 wt% of polymerizable unsaturated acid group containing

Art Unit: 1796

monomers, b) 0.001 to about 0.001 to about 5.0% by weight of internal crosslinking agents, c) 0.001 to about 5.0% by weight of surface crosslinking agent, g) from about 0.01 to about 5% by weight of an insoluble inorganic powder and h) from about 0.01 to 0.5% by weight of a thermoplastic polymer [claim 1].

22. The instant claims are obvious variants of the patent claims, as evidenced by the specification of the patent: In the examples, Smith discloses superabsorbent polymer particles having a particle size of 150-850 microns [column 15 lines 45-49] that are prepared from a) acrylic acid [column 15 line 26] and c) an alkylene carbonate surface crosslinking agent [column 5 lines 27-34]. The inorganic particle g) is a fumed silica (AEROSIL 200) [column 15 lines 60-62] included in an amount of 0.4 % by weight [Table 2]. The thermoplastic polymer h) is preferably a polyester adhesive [Table 2 Examples 7-10] included in an amount of 0.15 or 0.3 % by weight [Table 2 Examples 7-10]. The polymers according to Smith can be employed in many products including sanitary towels, diapers or in wound coverings [column 9 lines 26-30] which read on a composite and a chemical product comprising the polymer particles. The inorganic particles g) preferably have a particle size of 100µm or less [column 6 lines 57-59].

23. Regarding the limitations toward inherent properties in claims 1-4 and 11, all the compositional and structural limitations of the powdery water absorbing polymer and each of its components are disclosed in Smith. Henceforth, all the claimed inherent properties of the materials must be present in the disclosed compositions and components. These properties are held to be inherently disclosed by Smith.

Art Unit: 1796

24. Regarding the limitations in claim 1, 18 and 28 requiring that the fine particle, thermoplastic adhesive, and water absorbing polymer particles are contacted during the production process of the water-absorbing particles or during secondary crosslinking are product-by-process limitations. The methods by which claimed composition are created by are not pertinent, unless applicant can show a different product is produced.

25. “[T]hose portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent.” In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970).

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

27. Applicants argue that Smith et al is not prior art because it was not filed before the foreign priority date of the present application based on DE 103 34 286.9 filed July 25, 2003; a certified copy of which was filed with the USPTO. This argument is not convincing. Applicants must file a certified **translation** of the German application in order to perfect priority and overcome the 102(e) rejection based on Smith et al.

28. Applicants argue that Mukaida et al does not disclose the use of a resin powder at less than 0.5% by weight of the polymer as recited in the amended claim 1. This argument is not convincing. Mukaida et al disclose the use of a resin powder in an amount as low as 0.5 parts by weight per 100 parts by weight of superabsorbent

Art Unit: 1796

polymer particles. This amount corresponds to 0.498% by weight of resin powder.

Furthermore, when the inorganic particle is added the % by weight of resin powder will be even lower. The disclosed range, henceforth, overlaps with the claimed range from about 0.001 to less than 0.5 percent by weight. In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 1469-71, 43 USPQ2d 1362, 1365-66 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MIKE DOLLINGER whose telephone number is (571)270-5464. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/mmd/

/RANDY GULAKOWSKI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796